

PHILLIPS DAYES LAW GROUP PC
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
3101 North Central Avenue
Suite 1500
Phoenix, Arizona 85012
(602) 258-8900
minute_entries@phillipslaw.com

Trey Dayes (AZ Bar # 020805)

treyd@phillipsdayeslaw.com

Dawn M. Sauer (AZ Bar # 030271)

dawns@phillipsdayeslaw.com

John L. Collins (AZ Bar # 030351)

johnc@phillipsdayeslaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Jeanne McGuire, a single woman,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Fresh Start Handicapped Workers, Inc., an
Arizona Corporation; Paul M. Giza and Martha
Giza, husband and wife,

Defendants.

Case No.:

COMPLAINT

JURY DEMAND

Plaintiff alleges as follows:

NATURE OF THE CASE

1. The Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA") is designed to eliminate "labor conditions detrimental to the maintenance of the minimum standard of living necessary for health, efficiency and general well-being of workers" 29 U.S.C. § 202(a). To achieve its goals, the FLSA sets minimum wage and overtime pay requirements for covered employers.

1 U.S.C. §§ 206(a) & 207(a).

2 2. Employers must compensate employees for all work that employers permit
3 employees to perform. See 29 C.F.R. § 785.11. In such cases, it is the responsibility of
4 employers' management to ensure that work is not performed if management does not desire
5 for such work to be performed. 29 C.F.R. § 785.13. Employers may not accept the benefits of
6 employees performing work without compensating the employees for their work. *Id.*

7 3. Plaintiff brings this action against Defendants for unlawful failure to pay
8 overtime wages in direct violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 201 *et seq.*
9 (“FLSA”) and specifically the overtime provision of the Act found at § 207(a).

10 4. For at least three (3) years prior to the filing of this complaint, Plaintiff worked
11 up to twenty (20) hours in excess of forty (40) hours per week and was not paid time and a
12 half.

13 5. Plaintiff seeks to recover unpaid overtime compensation and an equal amount of
14 liquidated damages, including interest thereon, statutory penalties, and attorneys’ fees and
15 costs pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

16 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

17 6. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter and the parties hereto pursuant
18 to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), and 28 U.S.C. § 1331.

19 7. Venue is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) because all or a substantial part of the
20 events or omissions giving rise to the claims occurred in this District.

21 8. The named Defendants, by virtue of their own acts and omissions or by virtue of
22 the acts and omissions committed by one or more of their agents, employees or representatives,
23 as described herein, have conducted business or caused events to occur within the District of
24 Arizona and, more particularly, within Maricopa County, Arizona, as more particularly
25 described herein so as to give rise to both subject matter and personal jurisdiction of this Court.

PARTIES

9. At all times material hereto, Plaintiff was, and continues to be, a resident of Maricopa County, Arizona.

10. At all times material hereto, Fresh Start Handicapped Workers, Inc. was incorporated in the State of Arizona and has its principle place of business at 2910 North 35th Avenue, Suite #1, Phoenix, Arizona 85017.

11. Upon information and belief, Paul Giza and Martha Giza are the owners of Fresh Start Handicapped Workers, Inc.

12. Upon information and belief, Paul Giza was and continues to be a resident of Maricopa County.

13. Martha Giza is Paul Giza's wife. Paul and Martha Giza have caused events to take place giving rise to this Complaint to which their marital community is fully liable.

14. At all relevant times, Plaintiff was an "employee" of Defendants, as defined by 29 USC § 203(e)(1).

15. The provisions set forth in 29 U.S.C § 206 and § 207, respectively, of the FLSA apply to Defendants.

16. At all relevant times, Defendants were, and continue to be, an employer as defined in 29 U.S.C. § 203(d).

17. At all times material to this action, Defendants were, and are, an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce as defined by § 203(s)(1) of the FLSA.

18. Upon information and belief, at all relevant times, the annual gross revenue of Defendants exceeded \$500,000.00.

///

///

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

19. Defendants specialize in telemarketing.

20. Defendants hired Plaintiff as a non-exempt hourly paid account verifier in 2001.

21. Plaintiff's job responsibilities included verifying new product orders and taking payments by phone.

22. Plaintiff's regular salary was \$13.00 an hour through June 30, 2011. Plaintiff's regular salary was \$13.50 an hour from July 1, 2011 until the end of her employment. She regularly worked a daytime schedule of forty (40) hours per week.

23. In December of 2007, Plaintiff began working additional shifts at night at in excess of forty (40) hours per week.

24. Plaintiff worked additional shifts at night from December 2007 through April 2012.

25. Plaintiff's job responsibilities were similar during her night shifts.

26. Plaintiff was only paid an hourly rate of \$10.00 per hour for the night shift work.

27. Plaintiff resigned in July of 2013.

28. Plaintiff was not a manager.

29. Plaintiff did not exercise discretion and independent judgment with respect to matters of significance.

30. From December 2007 through April 2012 Plaintiff regularly worked between fifty-six (56) and sixty-four (64) hours per week.

31. From December 2007 through April 2012, Defendants failed to properly compensate Plaintiff for overtime hours in weeks she worked over forty (40) hours.

32. Upon information and belief, the records concerning the number of hours worked and amounts paid to Plaintiff are in the possession and custody of the Defendants.

///

1 46. The Court has jurisdiction to hear Plaintiff's request for declaratory relief
2 pursuant to the Declaratory Judgment Act 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201-2202.

3 47. Plaintiff may obtain declaratory relief.

4 48. Defendants employed Plaintiff.

5 49. Defendants are enterprises covered by the FLSA.

6 50. Plaintiff was individual covered by the FLSA.

7 51. Plaintiff is entitled to overtime wages pursuant to 29 USC § 207.

8 52. Plaintiff is entitled to an equal amount of liquidated damages as Defendant's
9 policy of failing to pay proper overtime compensation remains in effect.

10 53. Defendants did not rely on a good faith defense in its failure to abide by the
11 provisions of the FLSA and failure to pay overtime compensation.

12 54. It is in the public interest to have these declarations of rights recorded. Plaintiff's
13 declaratory judgment action serves the useful purposes of clarifying and settling the legal
14 relations at issue, preventing future harm, and promoting the remedial purposes of the FLSA.

15 55. The declaratory judgment action further terminates and affords relief from
16 uncertainty, insecurity, and controversy giving rise to the proceeding.

17 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that a judgment be entered in her favor
18 against Defendants:

19 a. Declaring, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202, that the acts and
20 practices complained of herein are in violation of the overtime provisions of
21 the FLSA.

22 b. For Plaintiff's costs incurred in this action.

23 c. Awarding Plaintiff's reasonable attorney's fees and costs and expenses of the
24 litigation pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b);

25 d. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff hereby requests that upon trial of this action, all issues be submitted to and determined by a jury except those issues expressly reserved by law for determination by the Court.

Dated: October 30, 2013

Respectfully submitted,

PHILLIPS DAYES LAW GROUP PC

/s/ Dawn M. Sauer
Dawn M. Sauer, Esq.
Attorney for Plaintiff